

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in the instant application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). On February 17, 2006, a telephone interview was conducted between the Applicant's representative and Examiners Shedrick and Corsaro. The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiners' time and assistance in reviewing the claimed subject matter in view of the cited art reference. In response to the telephone interview, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 8, and 14-16 as suggested by the Examiners. The Applicant submits that claims 1-19, and 21-23 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102**

Claims 1-19 and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Urban et al. Pub. No. US 2004/0209605 (hereinafter "Urban"). With respect to claim 1, the Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections because Urban does not teach each and every element recited therein. Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

***"retrieving a service profile for a recipient terminal from a service profile database in response to initiation of a communication by an originator terminal to the recipient terminal, the service profile retrieved using a recipient terminal address in the communication initiation, the service profile specifying a service plan and terminal capability of the recipient terminal;***

***retrieving information elements associated with the originator terminal from a network database, said retrieving based upon at least one of the service plan and terminal capability of the recipient terminal; and***

***transmitting a communication including said information elements to said recipient terminal prior to establishing a communications session with said recipient terminal."***

No new matter has been entered by this amendment. Support may be found throughout the Applicant's Specification and Figures (e.g., Figure 3 provides "Query SPD with RT address '1235551214'" in response to a "Voice call to R1" with arrow from Switch/Router to the service profile database (SPD); Figure 3 also illustrates "Service profile for RT retrieved from SPD via the arrow to the Switch/Router). As recited in claim 1, and as shown throughout Figure 3, the information elements of the communication are derived by retrieving a service profile for a recipient terminal *using the recipient terminal's address* (i.e., the address resulting from initiation of the communication), and transmitting the communication and information elements based upon the service plan and terminal capabilities of the recipient terminal (emphasis added). As recited in claim 1 and as supported by, e.g., Figure 3, there are no access numbers or indirect actions to be performed by the originating terminal prior to implementing the communication transmission including information elements. By contrast, Urban requires some proactive measures from the originator terminal prior to executing the communication. Specifically, Urban teaches that a calling party selects one of various options by entering information "on a touch-tone keypad or by speaking into a receiving audio subsystem and stating the word 'one'. This entry would then prompt the calling party through choices such as accessing recently sent Caller ID Messaging Signals, alphanumeric listings of each receiving party, and so on. After making a selection, the telecommunications network 710 retrieves the stored Caller ID Messaging Signal from the database 719" (Paragraph 0057). Thus, any options available to a calling party require some pre-processing steps; that is, the calling party must dial up an access number (which is different from the recipient terminal address) and select from options before any communications are implemented. As recited in Applicant's claim 1, and as supported by Figure 3, there are no actions required from the originator terminal other than simply entering a recipient terminal's address into the device. Accordingly, because Urban does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicant's claim 1, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Urban and is in condition for allowance. Claims 8 and 15 recite a storage medium and system, respectively, for transmitting enhanced originator information over a communications network. Claims 8 and 15 recite features that are substantially similar to those recited in claim 1. At least for this reason, the Applicant

submits that claims 8 and 15 are not anticipated by Urban and are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-7 and 21 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. Claims 9-14 and 22 depend from what should be an allowable claim 8. Claims 16-19 and 23 depend from what should be an allowable claim 15. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19, and 21-23 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to the Applicant. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAMUEL ZELLNER

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicant's Attorneys

By Marisa J. Dubuc  
Marisa J. Dubuc  
Registration No. 46,673  
Customer No. 36192

Date: May 1, 2006  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Fax: (860) 286-0115